UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,995	01/09/2006	Andrea Milanesi	DE03 0240 US1	7025
65913 <b>NXP</b> , B.V.	7590 04/07/201	EXAMINER		
NXP INTELLE	ECTUAL PROPERTY	CERULLO, LILIANA P		
M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY	DRIVE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN JOSE, CA	95131	2629		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/07/2011	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/563,995	MILANESI, ANDREA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LILIANA CERULLO	2629	

	LILIANA CERULLO	2629	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 01 April 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	lvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth it ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the state forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1. ension and the corresponding amount of nortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of e appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b  (a) They raise new issues that would require further con  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belov  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	sideration and/or search (see NOT v); er form for appeal by materially red	E below);	
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>			·
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1-17.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	rercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. $\square$ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (label{eq:note} Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Kevin M Nguyen/ Acting SPE of Art Unit 2629	/L. C./ Examiner, Art Unit 2629		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On the Remarks dated 4/1/2011 pg. 7-8, the Applicants argue that Tsuchi ('749) and Sakurai ('548) fail to disclose an input stage "configured to keep the ratio of the transconductance of the NMOS transistor doublet and the transconductance of the PMOS transistor doublet constant" because the Tsuchi's input stage (Fig. 1) is not an equivalent of Sakurai's input stage (Fig. 1) and teaches away from using the cited embodiment because the '548 Fig. 1 is used as background art and thus it's described with undesired performance. The examiner must respectfully disagree, note that the switches 112-119 in Tsuchi's Fig. 1 are used to obtain the configurations shown in Tsuchi's Figs. 3A-3B, which continue to show a differential pair with two p-type and two n-type transistors, such as the described in Sakurai's Fig. 1; thus the concept of the output current and consequently of the constant transconductance as taught by Sakurai in cols. 1-2 is equivalent to the observed in Tsuchi's differential amplifier. With respect to Sakurai teaching away from the claimed invention because it is described in the background, please note that Sakurai describes the operation of a conventional diferential pair op. amp which was used in VLSI circuits. The Applicant also argues with respect to claim 2 (see Remarks dated 4/1/2011 pg. 8) that Nishimura ('255) fails to disclose the switching for operation based on positive/negatve gamma data, please see Final Rejection dated 2/03/2011 pg. 16 for a response to these arguments.